REMARKS

Amendments

Claim 2 was amended by inserting the word "and," for clarity.

New claim 23 has been added. New claim 23 is similar to original claim 1 but specifies that sub-encode streams are associated with different sized segments in a composed layout. This amendment is supported by paragraph [0018] and Fig 1A.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, 8, 12, 16-17, 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lai et al (U.S. Pat. 6,288,740, hereinafter Lai). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of independent claims 1, 12, and 17 include a limitation concerning one or more sub-encoded streams, wherein the sub-encoded streams are associated with a segment in a composed layout. Claim 1, for example, recites:

> converting each one of the two or more compressed video input streams into one or more sub-encoded stream, wherein each one of the sub-encoded streams is associated with a segment in the at least one compressed output stream of the composed layout

Lai does not appear to teach sub-encoded streams that are associated with a segment in a lay out. Referring to Fig. 2 of Lai and the discussion thereof (col. 4, l. 55 – col. 5, l. 26), which was referred to by the Examiner, it is apparent that Lai does not teach a sub-encoded stream, as the term is used in the present application. The Examiner contends that Lai teaches sub-encoding, but a review of Lai reveals that Lai does not. Rather, according to Lai, a processor receives compressed stream from an endpoint, decodes the stream, and puts the decoded data on a bus. *See* Fig. 2. The bus contains un-encoded data from each of the endpoints. To send a stream to a particular endpoint, a processor corresponding to that endpoint retrieves and spatially mixes the un-encoded data into and image, and re-encodes image. *See* col. 5, ll. 55-60. The process of retrieving, mixing, and re-encoding the data occurs at each endpoint's processor.

Thus, the same un-encoded data is likely encoded at several different processors; a redundancy inherent to Lai's process because Lai's process does not include sub-encoding the video.

The redundancy inherent in Lai's method is remedied by converting each of the two or more compressed video input streams into one or more sub-encoded streams that are associated with a segment in a composed layout. The sub-encoded streams for a particular segment in a layout can be used by multiple output modules. Encoding is done only once per size of a conferee's layout or once per compression parameter set. *See*, e.g., paragraphs [0021]-[0023] of the present application.

Lai does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 12, and 17, and thus does not anticipate the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6-7, 9-10, 11, 13-15, 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai in view of Wang et al. (U.S. 2003/0099294, hereinafter Wang). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Lai does not appear to teach converting each of the two or more compressed video input streams into one or more sub-encoded streams that are associated with a segment in a composed layout. Likewise, the secondary reference Wang does not appear to teach this limitation. Therefore, the combination of Lai and Wang does not render the claims obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 6-7, 9-10, 11, 13-15, 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Should the Examiner have any questions on this paper, please directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion, reconsideration, and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

November 4, 2005
Date

Raymond S. Reese
Registration No. 47,891

Customer No. 29855
WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH,
RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, LLP
20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77070
Direct: 832/446-2437
Fax: 832/446-2424

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office Facsimile No. **571/273-8300** on Date: November 4, 2005

Rebecca R. Ginn